

hgm

Journal

Office of Legislative Counsel

Thursday - 19 January 1956

1. Met with Senator Saltonstall to brief him on 3 matters which he had raised at an earlier meeting with the Director -- the number of people in CIA, the nature of our operation [redacted]

STAT
STAT

The Senator now understand that CIA has [redacted] people at headquarters, as against [redacted] he had assumed earlier. Figures were also given to the Senator as to numbers of personnel in the field, and he was told that our total was now in the neighborhood of [redacted]

STAT
STAT

STAT

STAT

STAT
STAT

50X1

The Senator requested me to talk further to the Director about the Joint Committee problem which continues to trouble him. He indicated that the Senate Rules Committee was starting hearings on the Mansfield Resolution on ^{Wednesday} Thursday, January ^{25th} 26th. He indicated that Senator Russell, in a letter to Senator Green, had gone on record in writing in opposition to the Mansfield Resolution. Senator Saltonstall told me it was "a good letter", but I did not see a copy. He indicated that Senator Hayden, who is a member of the Rules Committee, is also opposed to the Mansfield Resolution, but Senator Saltonstall feels that a majority of the Committee may well be in favor of it. He therefore feels that we must exert efforts both in Committee and on the Floor if the Committee vote is favorable to the Mansfield Resolution, and in this connection wants to know just how far the Director thinks he could go, either as a witness or in Floor debate in pointing out the specific reasons why such a Joint Committee is undesirable. He has asked that the Director get in touch with him on this point and discuss with him what he can and cannot say in public on the subject.

STAT

2. Messrs. [] and Paul visited Roger Jones of the Bureau of the Budget to discuss proposed changes in the Missing Persons legislation. We proposed two specific changes to the language which the Department of Defense had proposed. The first change dealt with the coverage clause, and Mr. Jones indicated that the Bureau of the Budget strongly preferred the Defense language. We conceded that CIA could live within this language, although we would prefer our substitute language. Mr. Jones accepted the proposed CIA language extending the determination of status provisions to dependents, and indicated that he would inform Defense that he was accepting our proposal.

3. Gave to Mr. Jones the CIA draft of an Executive Order on the President's Board of Consultants, which had been cleared previously with the Attorney General. At Mr. Jones' request, I agreed to bring him a letter of transmittal signed by the Director, indicating the concurrences obtained and requesting expeditious action.

4. A third matter discussed with Mr. Jones was the status of retirement legislation. I specifically asked him whether he had any suggestions as to how CIA should handle its outstanding request from Senator Olin Johnston for comments on a retirement bill (S. 2875) which he had introduced on January 6th. I told him that we were preparing a draft which in effect compared the provisions of the Johnston bill with those of a draft Administration bill which had been previously submitted to us for comment. Mr. Jones said that this was a useless exercise because the Administration now was working on an entirely different bill, which he oped would be sent over to us by Monday, with a note requesting that we bear in mind the Administration proposals in commenting on the Johnston bill.